

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated September 15, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-5 and 7-14 were previously pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claim 15 has been added and claim 11 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 7-10 and 12-15 are now pending in the present application. No new matter has been introduced by the new claim added. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 and 7-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hattori et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0065693) (hereinafter referred to as “Hattori”). The Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the reasons noted below. The Applicants assert that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in at least independent claims 1, 7 and 8. For example, claim 1 recites the following features:

“[a]n information processing apparatus comprising a processor and an information notification apparatus, and is embodied in one of a portable generic computer, a Personal Digital Assistant and a cellular phone, said information notification apparatus comprising:

a rule holding unit operable to hold (a) an information notification rule which is generated based on information concerning a preference of a specific user, the rule defining that predetermined information should be notified to the specific user in the case where the specific user satisfies a predetermined condition and (b) an information notification rule which is generated based on information concerning a preference of another user;

an information notification unit operable to notify the specific user of predetermined information which needs to be notified to the other user, in the case where a condition which is defined by the information notification rule concerning the other user is satisfied by the specific user; and

a behavior determination unit operable to determine whether or not the specific user who received the notified information has behaved in a manner indicated in the notified information, based on one of an input received from the specific user and data related to the notified information, such that, when the specific user who received the notified information does not

behave in the manner indicated in the notified information, a notification occurs that includes a message positively asserting that the specific user who received the notified information did not behave in the manner indicated in the notified information.” (Emphasis added).

The features emphasized above in independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claims 7 and 8. Specifically, claims 7 and 8 both include determining steps that include the features of the behavior determination unit of claim 1. Additionally, the features emphasized above are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure (see e.g., Fig. 5B).

The present invention (as recited in independent claims 1, 7 and 8) is distinguishable over the cited prior art in that "a notification occurs that includes a message positively asserting that the specific user who received the notified information did not behave in the manner indicated in the notified information" (see e.g., Fig. 5B). The Applicants’ disclosure describes the example of "I'll buy milk" ("The father will buy milk" in the Specification). With the behavior determination unit of present invention, it is possible to address the condition when the father did not buy milk although he received a notification of "Please buy milk.” If this condition occurs, the present invention will display, for example, information indicating "Please buy milk because the father did not buy milk.” No such feature is believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies specifically on ¶ [0172] in Hattori for disclosing or suggesting a behavior determination unit that includes all the features noted above. However, ¶ [0172] in Hattori merely discloses a unit for producing a user’s purchase log by extracting a list of goods actually purchased (e.g., the purchase records from a POS system).

Nothing in Hattori discloses or suggests that the unit described in the reference is operable to determine whether or not a specific user who received notified information has behaved in a manner indicated in notified information, based on one of an input received from the specific user and data related to the notified information, such that, when the specific user who received the notified information does not behave in the manner indicated in the notified information, a notification occurs that includes a message positively asserting that the specific user who received the notified information did not behave in the manner indicated in the notified information.

Based on the above discussion, independent claims 1, 7 and 8 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Hattori. Likewise, claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Hattori at least based on their dependencies from independent claim 1.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the present application to issue.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Keiji SUGIYAMA, et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By 2008.12.15 13:34:14 -05'00'

Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794

Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 15, 2008